

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Stephan A. Wilson,)	C.A. No. 3:05-1429
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
United States Government;)	
Mrs. Rosario, HSA; Dr. J. Serrano, CD;)	
Dr. Blocker; and L. Guevara;)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Plaintiff Stephan A. Wilson filed the instant *pro se* action on May 27, 2005. (Doc. # 1). Defendants United States Government, Mrs. Rosario, Dr. J. Serrano, Dr. Blocker, and L. Guevara filed the pending motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment on May 16, 2006. (Doc. #22). As the Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, an Order pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) was issued on May 17, 2006, advising the Plaintiff of the importance of a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment. (Doc. #23). The Plaintiff was specifically advised that he had 34 days to respond and that if he failed to respond adequately, the Defendants' motion may be granted, thereby ending his case. Id. The Plaintiff failed to respond. On June 26, 2006, the Magistrate Judge signed an order stating the Plaintiff shall have 15 days to notify the court as to whether he wished to continue to prosecute his case. (Doc. #24). The Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond, his case would be dismissed for failure to prosecute. The Plaintiff did not respond to this order. On July 12, 2006, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and

Recommendation in this case recommending that this action be dismissed, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b), for the Plaintiff's failure to prosecute. (Doc. #25). To date, the Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. This matter is now before the Court upon the Magistrate Judge's recommendation in his Report that this action be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and the relevant filings in this case. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. #25), and this action is dismissed for lack of prosecution by the Plaintiff.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/ Terry L. Wooten

Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

February 12, 2007
Florence, South Carolina